

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 have been examined and rejected. Claims 10-18 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.

**Objections to the Specification**

The specification has been objected to for the phrase “do not pass the gaps” in the second paragraph on page 6. The paragraph has been amended to recite “does not pass the gaps.”

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 10-315648 to Yasumasa (“Yasumasa”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the Office Action, the Examiner discusses an interpretation of a configuration of Applicants’ claimed invention, but fails to provide reasoning as to how Yasumasa anticipates claims 1-9 as alleged. The naked assertion that “JP 10-315648 teaches claims 1-9” is not sufficient to show how each element of each rejected claim is disclosed by the reference, as required for § 102 rejections. Therefore, the Examiner should withdraw the § 102 rejection of claims 1-9.

Even in light of the above, however, Applicants believe that Yasumasa does not teach the claimed features. Yasumasa does not disclose or suggest at least a masking part supported by the edge of the window, the masking part consisting of a plurality of linear wire elements spaced from each other to form the predetermined opening pattern, as recited in claim 1. Yasumasa discloses that the shielding portions are made from the linear elements 12 and 14 and stencil 30, as shown in Figs. 1 to 3 and Figs. 6 to 9. On the other hand, the shielding portions of the masking part of applicant’s invention are formed by *only a plurality of linear wire elements*.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Yasumasa and therefore is patentable over the reference. Claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. If the Examiner believes the rejection should be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide reasoning showing how each element of each rejected claim is disclosed by the reference, as required.

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,855,467 to Amemiya ("Amemiya") or U.S. Patent No. 6,316,151 to Kim *et al.* ("Kim") in view of Yasumasa. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The combination of Amemiya or Kim with Yasumasa does not disclose or suggest at least a masking part supported by the edge of the window, the masking part consisting of a plurality of linear wire elements spaced from each other to form the predetermined opening pattern, as recited in claim 1.

As established above, Yasumasa does not teach these features. Amemiya does not teach or suggest use of *the wire elements* to create the shielding portions. Figs. 3 to 6 of Amemiya show a plurality of linear shielding elements 2, but Amemiya does not teach that *wires* can be the shielding elements 2. In Applicants' invention, each linear element is a wire.

Kim is similar to Amemiya and similarly does not teach Applicant's claimed invention. Kim does not teach or suggest the use of wire elements to create the shielding portions. Figure 5 of Kim shows the film 32a, but fails to teach that the film 32a can be made from a plurality of linear wire elements. Therefore, combination of Kim with JP '648 would not arrive at the applicant's invention as set forth in the rejected claims.

On the other hand, applicant's invention as defined in the claims uses only a plurality of linear wire elements to make the shielding portions and the masking opening is defined by only these elements.

Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to make the combination of either Amemiya or Kim with Yasumasa, the combination would still not arrive at the subject matter of the claims.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the combined references. Claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/750,975

Atty. Docket No.: Q78871

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Plati, Sr.  
Registration No. 59,153

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 3, 2006